

Message

From: Herrera, Angeles [Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/1/2019 2:10:34 AM
To: Manzanilla, Enrique [Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov]
CC: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Summary for Mike (DRAFT)

Notes are ok. One missing item is that the community specifically asked the Navy to release their PRG calculations and assumptions that weren't included in the draft Five Year Review. They would like an official comment period before finalizing the Five Year Review and approval for Parcel G workplan.

In addition, not necessary a comment for Chris but more a difference of opinion. I don't think the Navy answered the questions or the community concerns accurately (see highlighted text).

From: Manzanilla, Enrique
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 5:21 PM
To: Herrera, Angeles <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>
Cc: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Summary for Mike (DRAFT)

Let me know your thoughts so I can pass along to Chris. I spoke to him around 3:30 upstairs.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Ebbert, Laura" <Ebbert.Laura@epa.gov>
Date: January 31, 2019 at 5:08:46 PM PST
To: "Hage, Christopher" <hage.christopher@epa.gov>
Cc: "Manzanilla, Enrique" <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Summary for Mike (DRAFT)

This looks great to me, I like your recap and your reflections. Enrique of course will have input that may be more helpful specific to the content.

L

Laura Ebbert
Acting Chief of Staff
U.S. EPA, Region 9
(415) 947-3561

On Jan 31, 2019, at 4:33 PM, Hage, Christopher <hage.christopher@epa.gov> wrote:

This is what I would send to Mike yet tonight:

Hunters Point CAC MTG of 1/28/19

Angeles Herrera and I attended the meeting on our first day back from the furlough. I have had subsequent meetings with Superfund staff, which have changed my perspective on what was significant at the meeting.

The meeting began with a video and presentation by Dr. Sumchai. It did not contain revelations, but rather summarized the site history and discussed the serious health impacts of radiation. Dr. Sumchai does not believe the radium deck marker was the limit of what might be on the site. Dr. Sumchai insists the individuals should participate in a health screen and brought with her an example urinalysis kit.

Daniel Hirsch from UC Santa Cruz presented next. He had a prepared speech with PowerPoint slides that are available online. In summary, he was hired three years ago to research this site. Hirsch stated that he suspected it would be unremarkable, but he currently believes the types and amounts of contamination are more extensive than what the Navy has acknowledged. Moreover, Hirsch believes the Navy cleanup standards are decades old and therefore not comparable to current EPA standards. Hirsch does not believe the historical site assessment is reliable and questioned why Parcel A was found suitable to transfer in 2004 without sampling for radionuclides. Hirsch has already decided any plan to provide suitable cover is insufficient and only extensive removals will satisfy him.

The Navy's presentation was a series of their technical experts who can address radiation health risks generally and the cleanup procedures they have proposed. I believe they did answer the technical concerns raised by the preceding presentations, as well as the questions from the audience. However, their overall presentation was not strong.

Clearly the Navy will have to improve its public relations game and they still need to process concerns we raised a few months ago. After talking to our staff about the finer points of contention raised on 1/28/19, it seems that we have some work to do with the Navy.

- 1) The five-year review is late, and the public is asking about it.
- 2) The background standards for radiation exposure are not complete, and the attendees are very interested in how that is determined. The analysis will have to be solid.
- 3) Finally, the Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRG's) will be criticized by folks like Hirsch in any case, but the Navy has not adopted PRG's that we are satisfied with. We agree that those calculations must be available to the public for comment.

The members of the CAC, including the leadership at the front of the room, were less concerned with the technical aspects and more interested in the cause of delays. They want EPA and the NAVY to settle on a re-testing plan for Parcel G and then they want it performed or implemented.

Everyone wants CDPH to release their Parcel A report following the discovery of the deck marker. CDPH didn't attend the meeting and several parties have indicated that banks are waiting for the report to approve/disapprove loans.

We did agree to have a follow up meeting with Hirsch. I am confident our staff will handle that diplomatically, but he is never going to be satisfied with the final course of action.